



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

I 9

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/847,967 04/22/97 GOLDWASSER

I 016703-00080

EXAMINER

HM12/0102

RONALD A. KRASNOW, ESQ.
SYMYX TECHNOLOGIES
3100 CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY
SANTA CLARA, CA 95051

GARCIA, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1627

21

DATE MAILED:

01/02/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

File copy

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/847,967

Applicant(s)

Goldwasser et al

Examiner

Maurie E. Garcia, Ph. D.

Group Art Unit

1627

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 10, 2000☒ This action is **FINAL**.☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire THREE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 58-60, 64-72, and 74-80 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) 58, 59, and 79 is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-72, 74-78, and 80 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 19

☒ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Response filed September 20, 2000 (Paper No. 18) and Supplemental Response filed October 10, 2000 (Paper No. 20) are acknowledged. In the Response filed September 20, 2000, claims 2, 4, 5, 29, 36, 44, 50, 57, 61-63 and 73 were cancelled, claims 30-35, 42, 43, 64, 65, 68-72 and 74 were amended and claims 74-80 were added. In the Supplemental Response filed October 10, 2000, claims 42, 68, 70, 72 and 74 were amended. Therefore, claims 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 58-60, 64-72 and 74-80 are pending. Also, please note the change in examiner.
2. Claims 58, 59 and newly filed claim 79 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected species. Note that applicants have elected the species where in the materials are applied by electron beam evaporation, the materials are to be screened for optical properties and the materials are to be *inorganic materials, specifically ceramics* (see supplemental election of species filed January 4, 2000 (Paper No. 15)).
3. Claims 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-72, 74-78 and 80 are examined on the merits. Note that claims 74, 78 and 80 are being examined to the extent of the elected species (*inorganic materials, specifically ceramics*).

Withdrawn Rejections

4. The rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103 involving the Rolleston and Chern references have been withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments and amendments. Any other rejections or objections previously of record and not explicitly restated in this Office Action are also withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments and amendments. Note that the arguments presented in the Supplemental Response filed October 10, 2000 were directed only towards the Chern reference and thus are moot in view of the withdrawal of these rejections.

Maintained Rejections
Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-72, 74-78 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the materials and uses exemplified in the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the scope of all of the materials which could be used or all of the methods of evaluation which could be conducted encompassed by the claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-72, 74-78 and 80 are directed toward methods of making and evaluating arrays of materials. The disclosure teaches a number of materials that can be made. However, making and using any literally any material and evaluating it in literally any process by screening it for undisclosed and unspecified and unlimited properties for uses which are not disclosed does not appear to be within the scope of reasonable experimentation. The factors to be considered in a determination of undue experimentation are disclosed in *In re Wands*, (U.S.P.Q. 2d 1400 (CAF 1988)). The factors to be considered include: the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the predictability of the art and the breadth of the claims.

A number of factors would prevent one of skill in the art from practicing the invention without undue experimentation, these are summarized as follows:

1) The specification fails to give adequate direction and guidance in numerous areas:

1a) Applicant claims cover the application of any two or more component to a region to form an array. There is no teaching as to when different types of application processes will damage, alter or effect the properties of the material being applied with respect to the desired end properties which the materials are to be used for.

1b) Applicants give inadequate guidance as to which components from an endless variety of components (spanning any inorganic material) are to be combined and the means by which they are to be combined (e.g., fusing, interspersing, reacting etc.), to achieve specific properties.

1c) Even once an array is made applicants fail to give adequate guidance as to which materials will have given properties and what to use them for. For example, should organic polyolefin arrays be screened with any reasonable expectation of success for catalytic activity, optical properties, electrical properties, specific affinity for selected biomolecules or as antiinflammatory drugs, or simply for undisclosed screening purposes? Similarly should one screen an array of polyamides or niobium salts for the same properties or different properties?

1d) There is inadequate guidance as to how to evaluate arrays for the scope of the claimed subject matter, mostly due to the fact that there is inadequate guidance in the means by which screening for any property can be accomplished. The lack of guidance in screening techniques is exacerbated when the array elements approach the limits of the smallest size of the array, as many techniques and pieces of equipment are not adapted directly to such small samples in close proximity with other samples.

2) Applicants have failed to provide working examples commensurate in scope with the claimed subject matter.

2a) Applicants have provided a few working examples however, these are in no way commensurate in scope with the claimed subject matter.

3) The breadth of the claims.

3a) The breadth of the claims encompasses literally any material which is made by combining any two or more components.

4) The state of the prior art, the predictability of the art.

4a) The state of the prior art is such that arrays have been made which are used for a number of different processes. The majority of the arrays are directed biologically relevant organic materials.

4b) The art is inherently unpredictable because it is not possible to predict *a priori* which materials will have which properties, or how the methods of applying the materials will effect the properties for the scope of the claimed methods. Therefore, while it is true that the level of skill in the art is high, it would require undue experimentation to make and use the invention which is commensurate in scope with that claimed in the absence of guidance in the areas as set forth above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed September 20, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted that the claims have been narrowed to certain materials (namely inorganic and/or non-biological polymeric); however, the examiner maintains that the claims are still not enabled for their full scope. Applicants argue that they are enabled essentially because there is a large amount of knowledge regarding materials in the prior art and also taught in the instant specification (see, for example, Response, page 17, last paragraph through page 18, first paragraph). As stated previously, the examiner disagrees as the instant claims would cover literally any process of making any material which has more than one component and evaluating it for properties. While there may be a vast warehouse of knowledge concerning any number of embodiments encompassed by the claims, this is not commensurate in scope with

adequate knowledge of every type of material, their properties, the means by which to make them and test them as set forth by the claims.

8. Also as stated above, the art is inherently unpredictable because it is not possible to predict *a priori* which materials will have which properties, or how the methods of applying the materials will effect the properties for the scope of the claimed methods. Note that the art is unpredictable if one skilled in the art cannot readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which that claimed invention pertains (MPEP 2164.03). The examiner maintains that for the instant invention, anticipation of the properties of any inorganic material is inherently unpredictable.

9. Further, the examiner's position is that the instant specification does **not** provide the necessary direction and guidance and the level of skill in the art was not such that all of the methods needed to practice the invention were known. Please also note that arguments of counsel alone cannot take the place of evidence in the record once an examiner has advanced a reasonable basis for questioning the disclosure. See *In re Budnick*, 537 F.2d at 538, 190 USPQ at 424; *In re Schulze*, 346 F.2d 600, 145 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1965); and *In re Cole*, 326 F.2d 769, 140 USPQ 230 (CCPA 1964). For example, in a case where the record consisted substantially of arguments and opinions of applicant's attorney, the court indicated that factual affidavits could have provided important evidence on the issue of enablement. See *In re Knowlton*, 500 F.2d at 572, 183 USPQ at 37, and *In re Wiseman*, 596 F.2d 1019, 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979). Therefore

the rejection is maintained for the reasons above and for the reasons of record in Papers No. 14 and 17.

Maintained Rejections
Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 15-22, 30-35, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-67, 69, 71, 74-78 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 15-22, 30-35, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-67, 69, 71, 74-78 and 80 recite a method of evaluating an array where in the materials are screened for a property of interest. This is vague and indefinite because the claims fail to set forth what a property of interest is. Hence, it is not possible to determine what is included or excluded from the metes and bounds of the invention as claimed.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed September 20, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Although the claims now recite a step of screening for a property of interest, it is still unclear as to what this property is and how it relates to the particular material of the array. Applicant states in the Response filed September 20, 2000 (page 13-14) that "a person of ordinary skill can readily delineate whether or not they are

screening materials for a useful property". As the materials are very broadly defined as well as the potential "useful properties", the examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention and that the claims are indefinite.

Maintained Rejections
Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

14. Claims 8, 10, 11, 15-19, 23, 24, 26, 29-36, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-54, 60, 64-66, 68-71, 74, 77, 78 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cavicchi et al [US 5,365,756].

With respect to the independent claims Cavicchi et al disclose in their abstract (1) preparing a substrate for receiving materials through temperature and bias control, (2) deposition of materials to form a micro array, (3) processing (i.e., heating, cooling, etc.) the array in any atmosphere, (4) formation of alloys (i.e., mixing of components) on the substrate, and (5) measuring the resulting properties of the materials formed. The reference also teaches forming up to 1000 micro-samples in the arrays (col. 3, lines 37-50) and that each sample is prepared on a separate microfabricated hot plate such that the components do not substantially interdiffuse between the isolated microstructures of the ten or more regions required. The reference also discloses applying at least two materials

(e.g., Sn and oxygen) to form SnO_2 films (see figure 6). The reference also discloses the epitaxial growth (i.e., overgrowth in layers of a crystalline substance in a defined orientation on a substrate comprised of different crystalline materials) which reads on the materials comprising two or more layers (see column 13 lines 5-26).

Therefore, claims 42 and 68 are anticipated and as the materials used in the reference are inorganic, claim 70 is anticipated. In addition as the reference discloses the sample regions are less than 1 cm (col. 1, lines 57-62) claim 72 is anticipated.

With respect to the dependent claims:

As the reference discloses the microsubstrates can be used to prepare and test properties of the materials (e.g., electrical properties as discussed in the abstract and superconductors, col 13 lines 33-60) the reference anticipates claims 43, 69, 71 and 73 which are drawn to methods of evaluating the arrays of the independent claims.

As the reference discloses that materials can be delivered to all regions together (e.g., the Sn and oxygen were delivered to all regions at one the reference teaches parallel delivery. As the reference discloses that masks can be used to direct the application of materials to desired regions:

"Another deposition technique which can be used according to the present invention involves lithographically to define selected microsubstrates for deposition. For example, it is possible to coat an entire chip with a photoresist and thereafter expose selected micro-hotplates using a mask and appropriate illumination. Development proceeds by dissolving the exposed photoresist in a solvent in a known manner." (See column 10)
and

Claim 6. A method of preparing a plurality of micro-samples of materials for investigation according to claim 5, wherein said lithography process involves applying a resist material to said substrate, irradiating portions of said resist material utilizing a mask and removing said irradiated portions of said resist material the materials.

The reference discloses that materials can be delivered in sequentially to different regions. In addition claim 23 which utilizes physical masking is also anticipated.

As the reference discloses application of gas phase reactants to alter the stoichiometry the materials (see abstract) the reference anticipates claim 8. As oxygen may be considered the first or second component and it is delivered in a different amount

based upon the temperature the substrates during SnO_2 preparation (see figure 6 and associated text) the reference anticipates claims 10 and 11. As the reference discloses preparing up to 1,000 different micro-samples claims 15-19 are anticipated.

As the reference discloses that materials may be applied by electron beam evaporation it anticipates claims 24 and 66 (see column 10, lines 55-58).

As the reference discloses the preparation of superconductors and that optical semiconductor materials such as GaAs can be grown on the microsubstrates and analysis using different techniques including optical techniques (col. 11 lines 46-62) it, it anticipates the invention of claims 26, 29 and 50.

The reference also discloses that layers of materials can be applied on those that have previously been applied and hence claims 30-36 and 65 are anticipated. Moreover, as the apparatus is essentially planar (see figure 5) and layers may be applied to microsubstrate regions of the array, claims 44 and 45 are anticipated.

As the reference discloses that the applied components may be applied in layers (discussed *supra*) and that they may react (e.g., Sn and oxygen react to give SnO_2) and that chemical vapor deposition may be used to apply materials, claims 46-49 are anticipated.

In that the regions for microfabrication set forth in the reference are clearly less than 1 cm square, the reference anticipates claims 51-54.

In that the materials such as Sn and oxygen are inorganic materials claim 57 is anticipated. Moreover, the reference discloses that $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ superconductors, Si, GaAs and SnO_2 may be applied which read on ceramic materials and that:

"Pixels are also addressed to control properties during post-deposition processing steps such as heating in vacuum or various gases to alter stoichiometry of a single material, or to alloy multiple composition materials.", hence, claim 60 and 64 are anticipated.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed September 20, 2000 have been considered but they have not been found fully persuasive. The arguments were found persuasive with regards to the rejection of claims 20-22, 55, 56, 67, 75 and 76 under 35 USC 103, but not the rejection under 35 USC 102. With regard to the rejection under 35 USC 102, Applicant's arguments are focussed on the assertion that the invention is not anticipated due to the fact that the materials taught by Cavicchi et al are not in layers (i.e. are not two or more layers of delivered components) and are not variable in composition (see Response, pages 21-22). This is addressed below.

16. The examiner disagrees with applicant's assertion that the Cavicchi et al reference does not disclose two or more layers of delivered components. For example, films of SnO_2 are taught by the reference and are created by delivering first Sn (sputtering) then annealing in O_2 (see column 9, line 61 through column 10, line 45). This anticipates the claimed process as the Sn is one layer and the O_2 would be the other. This reads on the instant invention as defined in the instant specification, page 28, lines 6-24. Additionally, this specifically reads on new claim 77 since the annealing is performed simultaneously under a common set of conditions.

17. Applicant's assertion that the reference does not read on claim 80 is not persuasive since it is unclear what "consisting essentially of" would mean in the context of applicant's invention. For the rejection above, it is interpreted to mean the same as comprising. Please see paragraph 20 below.

18. The examiner also disagrees with applicant's assertion that the reference does not teach variable compositions. As stated in the rejection, multiple samples fabricated under a variety of conditions are taught by Cavicchi et al (see, for example, column 11, line 8 through column 12, line 3 and patented claims 1 and 15-20).

Maintained Rejections
Double Patenting

19. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

20. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b). Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

21. Claims 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-72, 74-78 and 80 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-67 of U.S. Patent No. 5,985,356. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are directed to methods of making and methods of making/evaluating arrays of inorganic compounds (elected species) by adding a first and second component of a material to different regions of a substrate.

22. Claims 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-72, 74-78 and 80 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-49 and 56-61 of U.S. Patent No. 6,004,617. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are directed to methods of making and methods of making/evaluating arrays of inorganic compounds (elected species) by adding a first and second component of a material to different regions of a substrate. It is also noted that the claims of the '617 patent recites making at least two arrays. As the arrays of the instant application are neither limited to being constructed on a single monolithic support, nor are the two arrays of the '617 limited to being prepared on separate supports this limitation does not distinguish the inventions. Moreover, preparing two or more copies of an array by method of the instant claims would read on the two arrays of the '617 patent. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably have been

motivated to prepare more than one copy of the array in order to use them in a series of destructive tests or to sell the arrays.

23. Claim 8, 10, 11, 15-24, 26, 30-35, 42, 43, 45-49, 51-56, 60, 64-72, 74-78 and 80 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 94-120 of copending Application No. 09/127,195. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are directed to methods of making and methods of making/evaluating arrays of inorganic compounds (elected species) by adding a first and second component of a material to different regions of a substrate.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

24. Claim 2, 4-5, 8, 10-11, 15-24, 26, 29-36, 42-57, 60, and 64-73 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/156,827. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are directed to methods of making and methods of making/evaluating arrays of inorganic compounds (elected species) by adding a first and second component of a material to different regions of a substrate. It is noted that in the '827 application the methods require dissolving components prior to addition. However, the instant application teaches and claims liquid dispensing of components and

using inorganic compounds (which includes salts) and renders obvious dissolving the materials first.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***New Rejections – Necessitated by Amendment
Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

25. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

26. Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim is indefinite because it is unclear what “consisting essentially of” would mean in the context of applicant’s invention. See MPEP 2111.03: The transitional phrase “consisting essentially of” limits the scope of a claim to the specified materials or steps “and those that do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristic(s)” of the claimed invention. In re Herz, 537 F.2d 549, 551-52, 190 USPQ 461, 463 (CCPA 1976). In other words, it is unclear what would and would not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the claimed invention.

Status of Claims/Conclusion

27. No claims are allowed.

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie E. Garcia, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:30 to 7:00 and alternate Fridays.

30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jyothsna Venkat, can be reached on (703) 308-2439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Application/Control
Art Unit: 1627

ber: 08/847,967

Page 18

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

BENNETT CELSA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Matt Celsa - 4 ch: 2)
12/28/00 SFR

Maurie E. Garcia, Ph.D.
December 27, 2000